DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 120 SO 012 832

AUTHOR Record, Wilson
TITLE Underprivilege and Unrest among Women and Black Social Scientists in the United States.
SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 78
NOTE 28p.: Paper presented at the World Congress of Sociology (9th, Uppsala, Sweden, August 14-19, 1978).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Change; Blacks; Change Agents; *College Faculty; Females; Higher Education; Males; *Racial Bias; Researchers; Research Problems; *Sex Bias; Social Action; Social Science Research; *Social Sciences; Whites

ABSTRACT

This review of research examines responses of women and black social scientists to discrimination within their disciplines. The attitudes of male social scientists toward these two groups are also examined. Although the difficulties experienced by women and blacks in the social sciences have been reduced in recent years, in actuality only a few have been able to cross long-standing barriers. Much of the change can be attributed to governmental policy concerning discrimination rather than originating from the discipline itself. Research indicates that many white males oppose government policies and try systematically to evade them or postpone compliance. Ironically, until quite recently women and blacks have been defined by the dominant white males in the social sciences. However, a mark of the elevated consciousness of these two underprivileged groups is their intense redefinition of themselves. These actions have several serious consequences. They raise misgivings about the way power and privilege are allocated, provide stimulus for social change, question social science wisdom concerning both sex and race differences and the methods employed in researching women and blacks. In short, actions by women and blacks in the social sciences have created reservations about the ability of white male social scientists to study in a detached and objective way groups about which they are likely to have strong subjective feelings. (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193120

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Wilson Record
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UNDERPRIVILEGE AND UNREST AMONG WOMEN AND BLACK SOCIAL SCIENTISTS IN THE UNITED STATES*

SP 012 832

WILSON RECORD
PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
PORTLAND, OREGON, 97207

*Paper presented at the Ninth World Congress of Sociology, Uppsala, Sweden, August 14-19, 1978. Research on which this paper is based is financed by a three-year grant from the National Science Foundation.

AUG 2 5 1980

Underprivileged groups in industrial societies have been subjects of a vast amount of sociological research during the past two decades, most notably in the United States. Much of that research has focussed on those groups which are on or near the bottom rungs of the socio-economic ladder.[1/] Examination of these lower, poverty, or under classes, as they are variously designated, has been prompted by a concern that their condition be thoroughly understood and that public policies for its betterment be adopted.

One unanticipated by-product of both research and policies on the underprivileged is that an ever increasing number of middle-rung groups now perceive themselves as also being seriously deprived. Not unexpectedly, they have expressed, through both established and specifically created new organizations, their deepening discontent and have demanded that something be done about it.[2/] Those institutions and agencies thought to be responsible for their plight have been pleaded with and pressured to take drastic remedial steps....soon.

Two such middle-status groups in the United States are women and black social scientists, whose natural habitat is the colleges and universities.[3/] Although much better off than the average woman or black, on almost any indicator that one might choose, these academic subgroups are far from happy. They protest vigorously the unwarranged privileges enjoyed by those who have the preferred genital arrangements or skin color.[4/]

Had they defined their present status as just and fair, as suitable reward for interest, ability and effort, they would have remained both untroubled and untroublesome. The authority of the system would have been accepted and internalized in the person, and fulfillment would lie in the enactment of established hierarchial roles.[5/] Probably no other development

has shocked white male social scientists as much as demands by women and blacks that non-sex and non-race gauges be used in the selection and professional socialization of those entering the several fields. They have responded not as a penitent in sack-cloth but as an Horatio at the bridge.

Collective discontent can be expressed in a variety of ways, one being social movements.[6] Precisely, this is what has happened among women and black social scientists, beginning with confrontations at meetings of professional associations -- in economics, sociology, psychology, anthropology, political science and related fields -- as long as a dozen years ago. Those tentative and ad hoc protests, disruptive as they were, have mothered (or fathered) more formal, durable and effective structures through which professional ideologies, organizational patterns and the distribution of power may be modified.[7] Slighted in this estimate are those functions related to protecting the individual member and providing him or her re-enforcement and a feeling of personal worth through group involvement. The heretofore resigned woman or black social scientist need no longer feel helpless when confronting the dominant white males on the formal or informal level.

Alleviation of the underprivileged positions of members of the two groups is far from complete; it is reasonable to expect that until it is, conflicts along sex and race lines will persist. Granted, the specific issues, tactics and strategies will change as, indeed, they have during the last ten years.[8] (The current white male backlash may slow, but it will not stop, women and black social scientists seeking abolition of privileges based on accidental and particularistic norms.)

Under what circumstances and to what ends do members of the adversary groups develop and act upon perceptions of themselves as underprivileged? Of course, this is not a new question. It has been asked about other groups and in other historical periods. Invariably, it has high priority for students of social conflict and social change.[9/] It continues to be raised because prior answers are ambigious or contradictory or because new technical and social developments present a changed empirical world which prior theories cannot accommodate.

Although a number of recent inquiries have addressed the question of race and sex discrimination in academe, they suffer from the recency of developments, the unavailability of essential documents, the lack of in-depth interviewing of the principal actors, almost unavoidable ideological biases, or from a narrowness of focus and limited data which allow few sound generalizations.[10/] This is not to say that revealing research has not been done or that it is not relevant to the present project. My debt to it is indicated in the documentation and in later portions of this text. And I have to confess that my own work is not altogether faultless.

I hope to show how women and blacks perceived underprivilege, how they responded to it, how white males faced challenges, and to interpret ensuing conflict as contributing to equity and to enhancing social science. First, however, a word about adversary groups. They are unique elements in two broad social movements that have flourished in the United States during the last two decades. They have basic and constant traits, sex or race, which they cannot readily change. Correlatively, they harbor grievances that are not easily resolved even when there is a favorable climate for both legal and social innovation. They manifest a high degree of group

consciousness that remains undiluted by concessions already won or policies already promised.[11/]

Further, the adversary groups have crucial resources and orientations which enable them to perform the intellectual as well as the organizational tasks incumbent upon collective actors who would change significant aspects of existing socity. Not surprisingly, they are capable of looking critically at the specifics of their own circumstances as well as at the historical, structural and ideological dimensions of the movement(s) as a complex whole.[12/] Combined are both the scholarly and prophetic roles which in a high-industry and high-technology society make them essential specialists in telling the underprivileged who they are, and why they are, and what they must do to be saved.

The threats which underprivileged women and black scholars pose to the established social science order assume two forms. The first involves a direct challenge to the widespread and long-established practices of sex and race discrimination in admission, training, hiring, tenuring, promotion, and compensation in each of the several disciplines. The second, involves a continuous, but frequently indirect attack on a number the received theories, methods, and doctrines whereby the dominant white males, in anthropology, psychology and sociology, have defined, observed and interpreted women and blacks in American society.[13/] Thus the organizational and intellectual foundations supporting the privileged positions of white male social scientists for almost a century in this country have been challenged.....and changed.

In the several disciplines, white males' privilege has rested heavily on their ability to restrict competition, to exclude, at least

potentially, about sixty percent of those who might otherwise vie for a limited number of valued positions. In fact, what developed in the social sciences was a dual labor market, with women and blacks limited to those positions defined as undesirable and to be filled by inferior types blemished by biology and culture.[14/] That it was a market created by white males was not a troublesome thought until quite recently.

It is striking that the impetus for change has come not from the social science departments and the professional associations, which could hardly plead ignorance of gross inequities.[15/] Rather it has been generated almost exclusively by the underprivileged groups or by external forces: legislatures, courts, administrative agencies and women and black social movements. Even now, after a decade of intense struggle, women and black social scientists must continue to press for those privileges due otherwise qualified professionals.

Historically, white male social scientists have emphasized that self-selection and self-governance are essential in serving the public good through advancing knowledge of human behavior.[16/] But, as much or more than other professional groups, they have used highly institutionalized discretion to serve the narrowest of collective interests. In the process significant components of the public, women and blacks in this instance, have been seriously harmed. Further, the general public, the society as a whole, has been denied the many benefits which would have flowed from the optimal development and deployment of these enormous pools of talent.[17/] There may be some perverse satisfaction in realizing that the white male founders of the social sciences and their heirs have not been the only privileged group which has managed to obliterate or at least blur the

boundaries between personal, professional, and public needs. Physicians, lawyers, dentists, corporate managers, pharmacists and teachers, even plumbers and hog farmers, have managed it quite well.

In the social sciences white male privilege has rested heavily on categorical exclusion. It was buttressed by flawed theories of human differences, highly questionable methodologies, and, at best, doubtful empirical findings, most of which were produced by the white males themselves.[18] When these "scientific" arguments have proved insufficient, white males have only rarely hesitated to invoke the most discredited popular prejudices in protecting their preserve: "Women are too emotional and can't think objectively; Blacks lack cognitive proficiency." The list could be readily extended.[19]

The difficulties experienced by women and blacks in advancing in the social sciences have been reduced in recent years. Much of the change can be attributed to the federal government which has prohibited sex and race discrimination in the scholarly as well as other trades, a traumatic shock to many established white males. It might be noted, however, that the government acted largely in response to the organized demands of women and blacks for equal access to privileged areas heavily populated by white males.[20]

Government policies have been enforced in slow and even convoluted ways. Nevertheless, the overall, long-term result has been the reduction of many long-standing barriers which only a few women and blacks, highly exceptional and fortunate, had been able to cross.[21] It comes as no surprise that many of the white males opposed the government measures and tried systematically to evade them or at least postpone compliance.[22]

In some case, however, white male-controlled departments voluntarily changed their procedures, admitting more women and blacks to graduate study and hiring them as faculty members. Whether this marked a change of heart or an opportunistic adjustment to the inevitable is not altogether clear. In the departments also token admitting and hiring of women and blacks became the means of choice for maintaining white male dominance.

Another arena in which the white males were challenged was the social science professional associations.[23/] Although they were voluntary, membership organizations lacked any legal or formal control over departments, they did have substantial moral and professional authority and no little influence. Under strong pressure from both government and adversary groups, they took positive steps to accord the sex and race minorities wider opportunities in both organization and discipline.

Members of the two groups were named to important posts:[24/] editorial boards of major journals, annual meeting program committees, special committees on the status of women and blacks in each social science profession, and commissions and task forces to engage in special research and deal with short-term problems affecting the two groups. Other steps taken by the "peak" associations included the hiring of women and blacks for staff position, establishment of fellowship programs for blacks and other minorities, the investigation of a limited number of cases of sex and race discrimination in local departments, a highly controversial move, and supporting the organization of internal sections and divisions focussing on sub-fields of special interest to women and blacks.[25/]

However, most of these steps were short and halting. They were not backed with decisive resources and there was strong opposition to

shifting funds from more conventional activities. Associations' resources were used largely for staging annual meetings, publishing technical journals, and meeting the more conventional needs of its members, employment services, for example. Even if the associations had allocated as much as half of their annual budgets to eliminating female and black underprivilege in their respective fields, the results, most likely would have been less than impressive.[26/] This probable outcome underscores the grip of a particular form of underprivilege that has been resident in the social sciences from the beginning.

Women and blacks, however, realize that the associations can do more. Too, they have learned that positive association responses in the future hinge on sustaining those pressures which produced the initial and subsequent actions. Confrontations have given away to less dramatic, and perhaps more effective, means of challenging underprivilege. In any event, future challenges are likely to succeed only with the strong backing of the underprivileged groups, with real and continuing grievances, acting together to realize shared goals. Previous gains are not necessarily self-sustaining, and backlash, about which more later, remains a real and close possibility.[27/]

Although the organizational sources of the underprivileged condition of women and blacks in the social sciences have been widely explored and documented during the past decade, the intellectual or idealogical ones, which, overall, are just as important, have not been as thoroughly examined.[28/] There is good reason. They are difficult to get at since they are widely, intricately, and frequently embedded in a vast social science literature, most of which has been produced by the privileged

white males. (The latter, I emphasize, are rarely dishonest or consciously self-serving. They believe what they say, whether it is grounded in popular prejudices or allegedly more respectable and more accurate social science findings.)

If the ideological props of white male dominance have been explained as appropriate by their principal beneficiaries, they have not escaped attention and attack by women and blacks.[29/] The adversary groups recognize that privilege begets privilege, that it is not voluntarily shared or surrendered. A crucial prerogative of the privileged is not only the definition of themselves but the definition of those who are less privileged. Further, they write the rules of the status game, selecting and annointing a few of those from the lesser breeds who will be admitted to their ranks. In the social sciences, at least until quite recently and to great extent even now, women and blacks have been defined by the dominant white males.[30/]

A mark of the elevated consciousness of women and black social scientists is their searching, intense redefinition of themselves, their tearing off the second-class and inferior labels stamped on them by the dominant white males. Together, these myriad acts have serious consequences.[31/]

First, they place in serious question the self-images and self-concepts of white males whose positions were always defined in part by reference to the specific low statuses of women and blacks in American society.[32/]

Second, they raise disturbing misgiving about the way in which power and privilege are allocated in the United States and they stimulate other groups to do the same, as we have previously noted.[33/]

Third, they provide both stimulus and examples for the development of ideologies of social change, leading other underprivileged groups to question and to reject the statuses they have been assigned.[34/]

Fourth, they call into uncertainty much of the received social science wisdom concerning sex and race differences, questioning as well interpretations of whole cultures and whole societies in which sex differences always, and race and ethnic differences sometimes, are crucial.[35/]

Fifth, they pose at times startling questions about the approaches and methods employed, mostly by white male social scientists, in researching women and blacks in this and other countries. They are questions that go well beyond those usually raised when a scholar's work is submitted to the judgement of his/her peers with a singular and shared frame of discourse.[36/]

Sixth, they make problematic -- they cast in doubt -- the results flowing from these methods, and they imply, if they do not specifically indicate, procedures that could produce contradictory or at least significantly different results.[37/]

Seventh, and finally, they create reservations about the ability of white male social scientists to study in a detached and objective way groups about which they are likely to have strong subjective feelings, lodged firmly in the professional as well as the personal components of the scholar.[38/]

The above criticisms by women and black social scientists stem from a realization that research on the two groups has been both erroneous and harmful. Prejudice and discrimination are clothed as respectable social science. The underprivileged status of women and blacks, they believe, is perceived as appropriate, even necessary. Such questionable research is used to define appropriate places and spheres for women and blacks in the society as a whole and in the institutions through which roles are taught and modeled.[39/]

Similar sex and race research in a variety of ways is incorporated in the socialization of new recruits to the social sciences, perpetuating long-standing patterns of inequality and propelling women and blacks to under-estimating themselves and over-estimating the dominant white males.[40/] It is understandable that women and blacks would direct much of their attack at this process which may have, but not drastically, changed during the last decade. Unfortunately, it is not easy to gauge the impact of the adversary groups in this area. However, most of their leaders whom I have interviewed during the last two years do not believe that their efforts have been in vain, although they have been surprised at the depth of white male resistance.[41/]

A related development is the effort of women and black social scientists to produce research which would partially correct those errors perceived in the work of many white males. In anthropology, psychology and sociology in particular there is systematic reappraisal of many of the received findings.[42/] Correlatively, alternative theories and new types of data are being used to produce generalizations less encumbered by sex and race bias. In this way, it is thought, the needs of women and blacks

as well as those of the social sciences themselves will be well served.

As underprivileged groups in professional social science, women and blacks have been perceived in much the same way as their counter-parts in the larger society. That is, they have frequently been ignored and have remained largely outside the vision of their fellow-professionals. When they are noticed, it is frequently as marginal groups with few, if any, members capable of doing high level professional work.[43/] If the women and blacks remain quiet and conform, they are likely to be regarded as weak, unassertive and uncreative, not at all promising as professionals. However, if they speak out and challenge the rules, they are perceived as emotional and aggressive, not at all promising as professionals. The adversary organizations have given many women and blacks the courage to speak out and to make demands on the established white males, almost unthinkable acts a dozen years ago. Thus, one dimension of underprivilege has at least been modified.[44/]

The advocacy groups have challenged the ideologies of male privilege in still another way. They hold that neither they nor the disciplines are well served when both the social science curricula and the professional journals re-enforce the traditional, white male-centric character of the study of human behavior.[45/] The two major means of communicating social science knowledge have long reflected white male dominance. However, in recent years changes have taken place in both curricula and journals. The causes of change are many and it is not easy to gauge the relative impact of the adversary groups. However, there has been some, perhaps crucial, influences marked by increases in the number of courses dealing with women and blacks and by changes in the content of

specialized as well as general offerings.[46] In the journals several notable shifts have occurred: More women and blacks are serving on editorial boards; more articles by and about them are being published. New women-oriented and black-oriented periodicals have appeared alongside the traditional ones.[47] In some instances the peak associations have mandated that articles be free of language deemed unfair to women and blacks, a good example being the American Psychological Association.[48]

Another development in the disciplinary or perhaps ideological area is the establishment of sections and divisions focussing on theoretical and research issues relating to women and blacks in the social sciences.[49] I have referred to them in passing; they deserve further attention. Those who join such units may or may not be members of the adversary organizations and membership is not limited to women and blacks. The sections or divisions operate within the established structures but they are frequently critical of them.[50]

The former are likely to be loci for new theories and research which otherwise might not be developed -- as they were not developed in the past. White males have raised questions about how solid and reliable such theories and research might be, given the sensitivities and the biases of the members.[51] However, this presumes that previous researchers, frequently white males, were detached and objective, a highly doubtful claim that I have dealt with elsewhere. Also, theories and research generated thus far by women's sections and divisions compare favorably with that of the white males.

Women's groups have been much more inclined to organize divisions or sections than have blacks. Strong units of women have been developed

in both sociology and psychology and to a lesser extent in political science and anthropology. Blacks in the first two fields have been urged to take similar steps, possibly forming divisions or sections, which would include them along with other minorities. In both instances black social scientists have been reluctant to merge their concerns with those of other minorities or to risk the isolation which, because of their relatively small numbers, might result.[52/]

Both adversary organizations and special sections or divisions have made women much more visible in peak associations and disciplines providing them platforms from which they may extend their organizational and intellectual concerns. No doubt, these developments have modified the underprivileged status to which they had long been relegated.[53/] However, the goal of equality remains far off, although its achievement in time looms as a possibility.

As for blacks, their attacks on theories and research in the social sciences have frequently hit the mark. They have also become more visible in the peak associations and in the several disciplines. Their grievances are widely known, along with the pluses and minuses in attempts to resolve them. However, their numerical base and their pool of in-place social science talent remain small and are likely to be expanded only slowly. They remain an underprivileged group, but not without hope or lacking support from some of their white associates.[54/]

This somewhat bright picture, however, is clouded by what might be characterized as "back-lash" developments.[55/] In the associations the momentum toward eliminating underprivilege has slowed; the rate of progress of both women and blacks is lower than it was five years ago.

In the intellectual area new or refurbished theories suggesting strict sex and gender limitations on women's achievements have received wide attention, a good example being found in the "new" sociobiology in sociology. In psychology the work of Jensen and similar scholars suggesting a genetic base for low cognitive capacities for blacks continues as a respectable interpretation.

There is a possibility, although in my view a remote one, of a diminution of militancy in the adversary ranks as some members come to terms with the system while others suffer battle fatigue or are exhausted in encounters with bureaucratic structures in both the associations and government agencies. I, for one hope that this does not happen, realizing that rarely in American society and in its elaborate institutional structure have white males surrendered either willingly or grudgingly those many privileges which they did not question or those powers which they assumed benefitted all.

A decade from now even the most dedicated white male supremacist among us may look back and concede that the women and blacks, who challenged white male privilege, strengthened the disciplines in both their organizational and intellectual dimensions.

FOOTNOTES

1. For a sampling of such inquiries see: Meissner, Hanna H., (Editor), Poverty in the Affluent Society (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973) Revised Edition, pp. 1-288.
2. Both the psychological and sociological aspects of this development are described by a number of the contributors in Friedman, Murray (Editor), Overcoming Middle-Class Rage (Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1971).
3. See: Scientific Manpower Commission, Professional Women and Minorities (Washington: 1975) for detailed information concerning increase in higher degrees awarded to women and blacks, 1972-1975.
4. In each of the social sciences women and black adversary groups have become permanent features of the disciplinary landscape: Sociologists for Women in Society, the Association of Black Sociologists, the Association for Women in Psychology, the Association of Black Psychologists, the Conference for Women in Anthropology, and the Association of Black Anthropologists are conspicious examples.
5. Rejection of such roles and the discontent on which it was based are examined in Roby, Pamela, "Institutional Barriers to Women Students in Higher Education," in Rossi, Alice and Ann Calderwood (Editors), Academic Women on the Move (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973) p. 37-56, and in Williams, Robert, "A History of the Association of Black Psychologists: Early Formation and Development," Journal of Black Psychology, Vol. 1, No. 1, August, 1974, p. 9-24.
6. Carden, Maren Lockwood, The New Feminist Movement (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1974) p. 234. Gusfield, Joseph R., (Editor), Protest, Reform, and Revolt (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970) p. 2.

7. In recent years there has been on-going debate within the new organizations on issues having to do with stability and compromise associated with the partial attainment of goals. A good example is provided by the Sociologists for Women in Society and another by the Association of Black Psychologists.

8. Johnson, Marilyn, "Social Research on Women in Politics," in Horowitz, Irving Louis, (Editor), Constructing Policy (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1979) p. 160.

9. Huber, Joan (Editor), Changing Women in a Changing Society, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973) p. 1-4.

10. The volume of material on both women and blacks in academe which has appeared during the last decade is almost overwhelming. The quality, however, tends to be very uneven. Even where substantial quantitative data are available, there is frequent disagreement on their soundness and interpretation.

11. Both women and black academics continue to be the foremost critics of discrimination based on sex and race, and are regarded as important sources of ideas and information useful to activist groups in other areas. It should be noted also that membership in almost all of the adversary organizations continues to increase while the scope of their activities is widened.

12. My recent field work has involved observation of and some times participation in national meetings of the adversary organizations in political science, psychology, sociology and anthropology. In each instance I have been strongly impressed by the length and intensity of the exploration of internal issues.

13. McCormack, Thelma, "Toward a Nonsexist Perspective on Social and Political Change," in Millman, Marcia and Rosabeth Moss Kanter, (Editors) Another Voice, (New York: Doubleday/Anchor Press: 1975) p. 1-33. For a sweeping critique of "conventional" race-relations sociology see the collection of essays: Ladner, Joyce A.,(Editor) The Death of White Sociology, (New York: Random House, 1973) pp. 1-476.

14. Feldman, Saul D., Escape From the Doll's House, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974) p. 21-36.

15. One indicator of the neglect in the study of academic women is found in Lipset, S. M. and Carl Ladd, The Divided Academy, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975). The authors state: "When the Carnegie Survey was administered in 1969, these sex-discrimination issues had not attained much prominence and none were included in the questionnaire. We were unable to treat here then, that segment of faculty public opinion, by sex, which involves specific interests of the two groups..... We must conclude, however, that as of 1969 there were no significant general ideological differences separating male and female faculty," p. 179. 1969 womens' caucuses had been formed in a number of the academic professional associations, including the American Sociological Association. Why were these developments ignored? The authors do not explain why they did not develop supplementary data relevant to sex differences during the six year lapse between the gathering of the basic data and publication of the book.

16. It is difficult to understand the tenacity with which this claim is defended when any male social scientist experienced in the colleague selection process cannot avoid being aware of the host of unspoken,

subjective rules that guide his behavior toward the exclusion of women and other threatening groups. Concerning long-established patterns of sex and race discrimination in hiring in academe see Caplow, Theodore and Reece J. McGee, The Academic Marketplace, (New York: Basic Books, 1958). The authors note, "Women scholars are not taken seriously and cannot look forward to a normal professional career. This bias is part of the much larger pattern which determines the utilization of women in our economy. It is not peculiar to the academic world, but it does blight the prospects of female scholars..... Discrimination on the basis of race appears to be nearly absolute. No major university in the United States has more than a token representation of Negroes on its faculty..." p. 226. These practices have been modified during the past two decades only because of pressures from organized women and blacks and the federal government.

17. Roby, Pamela, "Institutional Barriers to Women Students in Higher Education," in Rossi and Calderwood, op. cit., p. 37-56.

18. Clark, Kenneth B., "Introduction to an Epilogue," in Ladner, op. cit., p. 402-403.

19. Hacker, Helen M., "Women as a Minority Group," in Cox, Sue, Female Psychology: The Emerging Self (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1976) p. 158-160.

20. Recent court decisions have left somewhat ambigious, the present status of affirmative action programs in the colleges and universities as well as in the public and private sectors of the economy. However, the positive role of government in identifying and eliminating discrimination based on sex and race has not been questioned. See: Wilson,

William J., The Declining Significance of Race (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978) p. 110-111, passim.

21. Ibid.

22. In the colleges and universities white administrators much more so than faculty members have been willing to change policies in response to women and black social movements and government directives. Peterson, Marvin W., et al., Black Students on White Campuses: The Impacts of Increased Black Enrollments (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1978) p. 214-227.

23. Record, Wilson, "Organizational Responses to Sex and Race Adversary Groups in Academic Professional Associations in the Social Sciences," Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, New Orleans, November 4, 1977. pp. 1-20.

24. One measure of the influence of organized women's groups in such organizations as the American Sociological Association, the American Psychological Association, and the American Anthropological Association is found in the decisions of governing agencies to cancel meetings scheduled in state that had not ratified the Equal Rights Amendment.

25. For example: A Section on Sex Roles was established in the ASA and a division of Psychology of Women in the APA. Blacks in the APA have opposed establishment of a Division on Psychology of Blacks while those in the ASA have supported establishment of a Section on Race and Ethnic Relations. An example of a minority Fellowship Program is found in the ASA. See: Carey, Phillip (Editor) New Directions in the Graduate Education of Minorities, (Washington: American Sociological Association, 1976) p. 1-81.

26. It might be noted that only the American Political Science Association finances scholarships for blacks from its own funds. Programs in the American Psychological Association and in the American Sociological Association receive all their funds from NIMH. See: "The APSA Black Fellowship Program" (Washington: American Political Science, 1976).

27. Middleton, Lorenzo, "Black Professors on White Campuses," Chronicle of Higher Education, V. 17, No. 5, October 2, 1978, p. 9-10. Walsh, Mary Roth, Doctors Wanted: No Women Need Apply (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977) p. 272-277.

28. See: "Editorial Comment" National Women's Anthropology Newsletter, Vol. 3, No. 2, October, 1978, p. 1-3. Montero, Darrel, "Research Among Racial and Cultural Minorities: An Overview" Journal of Social Issues, V. 33, No. 4, 1977, p. 1-4.

29. Hochschild, Arlie Russell, "A Review of Sex Role Research," in Huber, op. cit., 249-267. Stafford, Walter, "Issues and Crosscurrents in the Study of Organizations and Black Communities," in Ladner, op. cit., p. 350-351.

30. Daniels, Arlene Kaplan, "Feminist Perspectives in Scciological Research," in Millman and Kanter, op. cit., p. 345-346. Whitney, W. Monty, Jr., "Black Social Scientists and Innovative Action Research," Journal of Black Psychology, Vol. 2, No. 1, August, 1975, p. 24-25.

31. "Redefinition" takes a number of forms at both the cognitive and the affective levels. "Consciousness raising" by both women and blacks in academe was seen as either a preface to or an integral part of the challenge to the white male dominants. Best examples are found in the Sociologists for Women in Society and the Association of Black

Psychologists. See: Bernard, Jessie, "Where Are We Now? Some Thoughts on the Current Scene," Psychology of Women Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 1, Fall, 1976,

32. Pleck, Joseph, "The Male Sex Role: Definitions, Problems, and Sources of Change," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 32, No. 3, 1976, p. 158-159. Staples, Robert, "Masculinity and Race: The Dual Dilemma of Black Men," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 34, No. 1, p. 169-170.

33. Among groups which have organized to use collective and political means for betterment of their condition are the blind, the deaf, the physically handicapped, the poor, and homosexuals. Their cues have been provided in part by the examples of organized women and blacks. In some cases women of minority backgrounds have developed intra-group organizations with which to oppose both white and non-white male dominance.

34. Very few of these groups, however, develop ideologies calling for the radical restructuring of society. Rather specific and immediate changes are stressed; these are seen as being possible through the established order.

35. In the late 1960's and early 1970's the challenges were frequently lacking sound empirical bases. However, research was high on the agenda of both the women and black associations in the social sciences. During the last few years women and blacks have established a number of journals of their own, for example, the Psychology of Women Quarterly, The Journal of Black Psychology, and the Black Sociologist, in which relevant research is reported. In addition, there has been a substantial increase in the amount of research reported in the major journals.

36. Daniels, Arlene Kaplan, A Survey of Research Concerns on Women's Issues (Washington: Association of American Colleges, 1975) p. 1-43. The entire issue of The Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 33, No. 4, 1977) is devoted to the topic, "Research Among Racial and Cultural Minorities: Problems, Prospects, and Pitfalls."

37. Tesemer, David, "Assumptions Made About Gender Roles," in Millman and Kanter, op. cit., p. 328-329.

38. Staples, Robert, Introduction to Black Sociology (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976) p. 4-5.

39. Freeman, Jo, "The Social Construction of the Second Sex," in Cox, op. cit., p. 137-139.

40. Schwartz, Pepper and Janet Lever, "Women in the Male World of Higher Education," in Rossi and Calderwood, op. cit., p. 74-76.

41. Both women and black academics now believe that gains of the last several years are increasingly threatened by court decisions, as in the Bakke case, coupled with the slowness with which federal agencies move in affirmative action cases.

42. In economics both women and blacks have been concerned primarily with inequities in admission, training and hiring rather than with the content of economics as a social science. Economics is not perceived as an instrument for defining them as inherently inferior.

43. Both black and women social scientists are particularly concerned with the professional socialization process and the tendency of members of these groups to accept the negative definitions of themselves by white males. See: Schwartz and Lever, op. cit.,

44. It is difficult to gauge the relative weights of adversary groups and federal government actions in reducing sex and race discrimination. However, both movements and government tend to play complementary roles. McCarthy, John D., and Mayer N. Zald, The Trend of Social Movements in America: Professionalization and Resource Mobilization, (Morristown, N. J.: General Learning Press, 1973) p. 13.

P# missing 45. American Political Science Association, op. cit.,

46. An examination of a number of introductory texts in sociology, psychology, anthropology and political science published during the last five years indicates that two significant shifts may be occurring: an increase in the volume of material on women and blacks and a more balanced interpretation of the data relating to them.

47. In addition frequent use is being made of specialized supplementary texts having to do with women and blacks in contemporary society. A somewhat mundane explanation of this shift is that many more women and black graduate students are now teaching introductory courses and make decisions on text book adoptions. The market is not the students but the instructors in somewhat the same sense that the market for drugs is not the patient but the prescribing doctor.

48. American Psychological Association, "Guidelines for Nonsexist Language in APA Journals," Publications Manual, Change Sheet 2, June, 1977, p. 8.

49. These units almost invariably publish news letters reporting on relevant issues and activities of members. In most cases they are represented on executive committees or councils or other governing bodies of the "peak" association. Some publish their own journals.

50. Becoming a member of a section or division within the "establishment" does not prevent the individual's joining an adversary group. Dual membership is quite common. In the adversary groups there is much more freedom of action on a wide range of issues.

51. The responses of both women and black adversary groups have been similar, that their purpose is not only to develop reliable research findings but to actively apply them in dealing with issues not only in the social science disciplines but in the society as a whole. The "liberation" of women and blacks is perceived as an obligation of the scholar. Green, Robert, "The Social Responsibility of Psychology," Journal of Black Psychology, Vol. 1, No. 1, August, 1974, p. 28-29. Association for Women in Psychology, AWP Newsletter, December-January, 1979, p. 1.

52. The peak associations, eager to expand membership of women and blacks, have been reluctant to establish costly internal instruments and personnel for providing the special services which women and black joiners desire. Because of limited resources the peak associations usually have to obtain outside funding for large-scale services to these groups.

53. For example, between 1970 and 1977 women's participation in APA annual convention programs increased from 15 to 28 percent, participation in boards and committees rose from 10 to almost 24 percent. During the same period their participation in the Council of Representatives, the governing body, rose from 6 to 20 percent. Women were 27 percent of all APA members in 1977. The ratio of women to men members was roughly the same during this period.

54. It is not unlikely that black students, like many of their white associates, will choose non-social science fields in view of the current dim prospects for employment of new Ph Ds in sociology, political science, anthropology, and psychology. It might be noted that the amount of space given to announcements of job opportunities in the newsletters of the adversary organization has increased substantially during the last three or four years.

55. Middleton, op. cit., Walsh, op. cit.